DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 091 UD 014 461

TITLE	Final Report on Needs Assessment of the Processes, Programs, and Services Used to Enroll Spanish-Speaking Students in Higher Education in New Jersey: Educational Opportunities and the Hispanic College Student.
INSTITUTION	Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey, Trenton.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	62p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Admission Criteria; College Administration; College Admission; Community Organizations; *Educational Needs; Educational Opportunities; Federal Aid; *Higher Education; *High School Students; Program Administration; *Spanish Speaking; State Surveys; University Administration; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS	*New Jersey

ABSTRACT

In 1973 the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, in an effort to improve the delivery of services to Spanish-speaking people in the State of New Jersey, granted monies to the Puerto Rican Congress for the purpose of conducting a Needs Assessment Study in Higher Education. Specifically, the study was to provide information to the Regional Director for Region II (New Jersey's region) in order to assist his efforts in strengthening recruiting programs; improve the administration of the Basic Opportunity Grants; assist the TRIO Program compponents in improving the delivery of services to Spanish speakers; and, enhance the use and administration of the RD (Research and Development) Review and sign off procedures. Four populations were involved in the research: university or college administrators, and Spanish-speaking community organizations. Fifteen colleges representatively distributed in the three regions into which the state is usually divided were selected because they are located in areas with large concentrations of Spanish speakers. Fifteen high schools in the state were also selected on these bases. In addition 15 community organizations which primarily serve the Spanish-speaking community were selected. (Author/JM)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 094091

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Report on Needs Assessment of the Processes, Programs, and Services used to enroll Spanish-speaking students in Higher Education in New Jersey.

Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey
222 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08608
(609) 989-8888

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Puerto Rican Congress of New Jersey, Trenton
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

The work presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to HEW 2-3-10002 Contract from the Office of the Regional Director, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and no official endorsement by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be inferred.

UD 014 464

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 094091

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

AND

THE HISPANIC COLLEGE STUDENT

Rev. Alfonso Roman
Chairman

Hector S. Rodriguez
Executive Director

* * * * * * *

John W. Gotsch
Research Director

Carlos Wesley
Raúl Vicente
Graciela Lauro
Carmen Jimenez Hyde
Ruth Pastoriza

© Copyright
(1974)

Puerto Rican Congress of N.J.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
The Research	2
The Findings	5
A. Policy Questions	
1. Impact of Recruiting Services	6
2. Impact of Counseling Services	8
3. Level of Academic Preparation	11
4. Information and Impact of Financial Assistance Programs	16
5. Puerto Rican College Student Profile	20
B. Additional Data	
6. The Community Organizations	26
7. The High Schools	31
8. The Colleges	34
9. Demographic Characteristics	39
Executive Summary	44
Appendix: Data Gathering Instruments	57

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

In 1973 the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in an effort to improve the delivery of services to Spanish-speaking people in the State of New Jersey, granted monies to the Puerto Rican Congress for the purpose of conducting a Needs Assessment Study in Higher Education.

The purpose of the assessment was to provide the Regional Director for Region II (New Jersey's Region) with an identification, analysis, and documentation of the level of effect themes, in the delivery of services to Spanish speakers.

Specifically, the study was to provide information to the Regional Director in order to assist his efforts in strengthening recruiting programs; improve the administration of the Basic Opportunity Grants; assist the TRIO Program components in improvi the delivery of services to Spanish speakers; and, enhance the us and administration of the RD Review and sign off procedures.

The Puerto Rican Congress presented a work plan to H.E.W. which included research designs appropriate to gather the data which the Regional Director needed. The research design and the research instruments were given final approval in September 17 of 1973. The data gathering commenced immediately after the final approval was given.

The Research

The research procedure was designed to answer the following questions:

1. Are the recruiting services of colleges reaching Spanish-speaking students? If yes, which services have been most effective? If not, why.

2. Are Spanish-speaking students receiving adequate counseling regarding the pursuit of higher education? If yes, by whom? Colleges? High schools? Community Organizations?, Other?

3. Was adequate academic preparation provided to Spanish-speaking students to enter college?

4. Is information about financial assistance programs made available to the Spanish-speaking students? Is assistance adequat to make higher education an achievable goal?

5. What are the academic, social, family commonalities among currently enrolled Spanish-speaking students?

There were some additional questions, but these more properly fall under the heading of recommendations.

The Puerto Rican Congress determined that at least four different populations had to be involved in the research, in order to gather the data required. These four subjects or components were: university or college administrators, Spanish-speaking college students, high school administrators, and Spanish-speaking

community organizations.(1)

Selected for the study were fifteen colleges in the state. They were selected on the basis of two criteria; one, their location in areas with large concentrations of Spanish speakers and, two, that they, as a group, represented the three regions in which the state is usually divided, North, Central, and South. Fifteen high schools in the state were also selected on the basis of the same criteria used in selecting the colleges.

In addition, fifteen community organizations which serve, primarily, the Spanish-speaking community were selected. Previous studies carried out by the Congress indicate that community organizations are among the main centers for referrals to services and information that function in the Spanish-speaking communities. That is, our prior research indicates that Spanish-speaking communities are more likely to follow up or find out about services, if this information is disseminated by the community based organizations. The organizations selected were chosen based on the following criteria: 1) they were well known and serviced large Spanish-speaking populations and; 2) they coincided, by and large, with colleges which we were surveying, and 3) they, as a group, represented the three regions of the state.

1. The rationale for using these four populations or components i given in the work plan submitted by the Puerto Rican Congress to H.E.W.

Researched Institutions

Colleges :	Montclair	Rutgers (Newark)	Rutgers (Camden)
	Kean	Douglas	Glassboro
	Rutgers (New Brunswick)	Livingston	Stockton
	Jersey City	Trenton	Camden
	Bergen	Mercer	Burlington
High Schools :	Woodrow Wilson (Camden)	Battin (Elizabeth)	
	Passaic	Hoboken	
	Vineland	John F. Kennedy (Paterson)	
	Trenton Central	John F. Kennedy (Willingboro)	
	Perth Amboy	Atlantic City	
	New Brunswick	Camden	
	Barringer (Newark)	Central High (Newark)	
	West Side (Newark)		
Community Agencies:	PRAB (New Brunswick)	Concilio (Trenton)	
	PACO (Jersey City)	FOCUS (Newark)	
	PRVA (Paterson)	PRIDE (Passaic)	
	OYE (Newark)	El Centro (Camden)	
	CASA PRAC (Vineland)	Model Cities (Perth Amboy)	
	Mi Casita (Camden)	ASPIRA of N.J. (Newark)	
		PROCFED (Elizabeth)	

Note: The order of institutions does not correspond to the coded institutions that are tabulated in various tables. As we have noted in earlier research studies: "It is not the purpose of either the research or reports to make qualitative and/or quantitative distinctions between the cooperating institutions."

Our fourth component, and the most important one was the Spanish-speaking college or university student. Fifteen students were projected to be selected in each of the colleges or universities which we were surveying for a total, expected, population of 225 subjects.

One research instrument was designed for each of the four components. The questionnaires to the college and high school and administrators were self administered. The mail was used for dissemination and collection. The interview schedules to the community organizations and the Spanish-speaking students were administered by interviewers trained by the Puerto Rican Congress.

In general, the information we sought could be divided into two broad categories: What is being done to improve the quality of services the Spanish-speaking populations received: and how effective are these services? The latter question is also divided into two aspects. An objective aspect, that is, can an unbiased observer chart increases in the numbers of students receiving services, amount allocated for financial aid and, in general, establish certain 'facts' about the service? Is he or she satisfied? Do they feel that the institutions that are supposed to serve them are doing all they can to fulfill their purpose for existence.

The data gathering instruments were designed to get information on the first broad category - what is being done? - from all four components. Information about the subjective aspect of the programs was only requested from our Spanish-speaking student component.

Of the colleges to which questionnaires were sent, we have received responses from all fifteen. All fifteen high schools have replied to our questionnaires. The community organizations have been researched by our interviewers. Two of the fifteen that were originally selected had ceased to exist by the time the study started.(2) The other thirteen administrators of community organizations were interviewed by our research team.

Of the projected 225 Spanish-speaking students, we have received completed interview schedules for 206. The reason for the discrepancy between projected and realized student interviews is that some colleges had less Spanish-speaking students in residence than we had anticipated for and consquently we fell short of the fifteen projected for each of the fifteen researched colleges.

All of the data has been keypunched and processed by the Department of Management Sciences, Stockton State College.

The Findings

The data that follows has been gathered from all the fifteen researched colleges or universities in the State of New Jersey, the fifteen high schools, and thirteen community organizations. The data regarding Spanish-speaking students comes from the tabulated responses of two hundred and six students.

---

2. The organizations which had ceased to exist were O.L.A. in Atlantic City, and COPRA in Camden.

A. Policy Questions

1. Are the recruiting services of colleges reaching Spanish-speaking students?

Spanish-speaking college student enrollment, in the researched institutions of higher education, has increased over the last three to four years. As can be seen in tables two and three, Spanish-speaking students totaled 1,598 or 1.9% of the total enrollment (84,593) of the fifteen researched New Jersey Colleges in 1972.

At the same time, in those high schools (A, B, C, E, G, I, J, and N) which presented data on Spanish-speaking graduates going on to college for all three years, the reported numbers were 137 for 1970, 185 for 1971, and 239 for 1972 (see table four). This purports a 74% growth rate, from 1970 to 1972, of Spanish-speaking high school graduates going on to institutions of higher learning.

To the question of recruiting services impact, the Spanish-speaking college students' responses to questions 34 and 35 of the student interview schedule (see appendix) deal with this directly and provide baseline data to this important question.

Almost fifty eight percent of the responding students polled indicated that communication with college officials had been effectuated while they were still in high school (see table

TOTALS FOR COLLEGES

Enrollment	80,593	
Spanish-speaking enrollees	1970 - 359 (10 of 15) 1972 - 1598	1971 - 669 (11 of 15) 1973 - 174 (3 of 15)
Freshmen - Sophomores Juniors - Seniors	Freshmen - 808 (14 of 15) Juniors - 219 (12 of 15)	Sophomores - 573 (14 of 15) Seniors - 158 (11 of 15)
Drop-outs	1970 - 50 (4 of 15) 1972 - 58 (9 of 15)	1971 - 56 (6 of 15) 1973 - 3 (1 of 15)
Post-graduate students	1970 - -0- (4 of 15) 1972 - 40 (9 of 15)	1971 - 1 (4 of 15) 1973 - N/A
Spanish-speaking students in Social Sciences	1970 - 105 (4 of 15) 1972 - 371 (7 of 15)	1971 - 164 (5 of 15) 1973 - 16 (2 of 15)
Non-Social Science students	1970 - 34 (4 of 15) 1972 - 434 (8 of 15)	1971 - 101 (5 of 15) 1973 - 43 (2 of 15)
Spanish-speaking counselors	Yes - 21 (14 of 15)	No - -0- (1 of 15)
Special Admissions Program Yes - 15 No - 0	EOF 11; Edu. Fnd. 1; Aca. Fnd. 3; 100 1; Open Door 1; Wkend College 1; TRIO 2; Talent Search 2; Reg. Dev. 1; 2nd CHANCE 2; Quest 1; Counselors 1; Comm. Agencies 1; Provisional Adm. 1.	
Special Admissions enrolled students	1970 - 199 (10 of 15) 1972 - 658 (13 of 15)	1971 - 384 (13 of 15) 1973 - 138 (3 of 15)
Remedial help Yes - 15 No - 0	Summer Seminars 3 6 wk. summer pro. 1 Counselling 2 Admissions off. 6	Workshops: Reading 6 English 3 Math 4 Speech 1 Writing 2 Skills Aca. Center 1 EOF - 4 ESL Tutors 4 Student Rec EEO 1 Faculty Community 1
Transfers from Special admissions	1970 - 44 (4 of 15) 1972 - 308 (7 of 15)	1971 - 149 (6 of 15) 1973 - 130 (3 of 15)
Culture and History courses Yes - 13 No - 2	P.R. History, Culture; P.R. Lit.; P.R. Child in Mainland; Latin Am. His. I, II; Social Problems; Hispanic Civiliz at P.R. Studies; P.R. Lifestyles; E.S.L.; P.R. Language; Soc ogy of P.R.; History of P.R.; P.R. Heritage; Intermediate	
Spanish-Sp. teachers	Yes - 14; No - 1	35 (10 of 14)
Spanish-Sp. receiving Fin. Aid	Yes - 13; No - 2	834
Financial Aid programs available Yes - 15 No - 0	Federal; State; Local; Work study; BEOG; EOF; NDSL; GSL; SEOG; EOG; NSL; University Schools; Nursing Scholarships; Scholarships; Loans; BOGP; CWSP; SGL; CWS; T.A.G.; Foundation Funds; Guaranteed Loans.	
Financial Aid office assistance to Spa.-Sp. students & parents with applications	Yes - 13 No - 2	12 (10 of 13)

COLLEGES	Total enrollment	Spanish-speaking enrollees	Freshmen Sophomores Juniors Seniors	Dropouts	Post-graduate students	Spa.-Sp. students in social sciences	Non-social science students	Counselors for Spa.-speaking students	Special admissions program	Special admission enrolled students	Remedial help	Transfers from special admission	Culture and History courses	Spanish-speaking teachers	Spa.-Sp. students receiving fin. Aid	Fin. Aid programs available	Fin. Aid off. assistance to Spa.-Sp. students & parents w. appl.
A	7,500	70 31 71 81 72 300	Fr. 135 So. 135 Jr. 20 Sr. 10	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 15	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	Yes 3 No -	E.O.F. Weekend college	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	P.R. His./culture, P.R. child in mainland, P.R. Lit.	3	N/A	Fed., State, local	Yes 1 No -
B	12,462	70 N/A 71 80 72 231	Fr. 66 So. 52 Jr. 40 Sr. 16	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 0 71 0 72 2	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 0	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 231	Yes 2 No -	Community agencies; visits to Kean Col.	70 6 71 15 72 25	Staff of E.E.O. pro. 6-wk. summer devel. pro.	70 6 71 15 72 25	See list attached (seven)	4	85	BEOG, NDEL, CSL, NSG, work study	Yes 2 No -
C	5,929	70 75 71 N/A 72 126	Fr. 35 So. 31 Jr. 32 Sr. 28	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 0	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	Yes 2 No -	E.O.F.	70 24 71 41 72 52	Reading Writing Math	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	Spanish History	Yes 1	97	EOG, HEF, NDEL, Scholarships, work study	Yes 1 No -
D	5,000	70 43 71 40 72 55	Fr. N/A So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	70 5 71 8 72 4	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	Yes 1 No -	E.O.F.	70 37 71 21 72 25	Counselling, Tutoring, Summer program	All 70 students 71 via 72 req. adm.	-	-	-	HEF, EOG, NSG, NDEL, work study	Yes ✓ No -
E	3,500 day 6,000 eve.	70 47 71 73 72 119	Fr. 85 So. 53 Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 42 71 53 72 72	70 5 71 20 72 46	Yes 1 No -	High School counsellors	70 47 71 73 72 119	Admissions office, workshops (speech, reading)	70 Open 71 policy, 72 all H.S. grads accepted	Latin Am. His. I, II, social prb., hispanic civ.	4	97	HEF, EOG, NSG., work study	Yes 2 No -
F	3,704	70 70 71 150 72 330	Fr. 150 So. 75 Jr. 70 Sr. 35	70 46 71 26 72 21	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 60 71 100 72 275	70 10 71 50 72 55	Yes 1 No -	E.O.F., academic foundation dept.	70 60 71 125 72 270	Adm. off., faculty & student Acad. foundation dept.	70 30 71 90 72 225	P.R. life styles, Spa. Lang./Lit., P.R. studies	5	162	HEF, SEOG, NDEL, NSG, work study, nursing scholarships.	Yes 1 No -
G	3,428	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	Fr. 40 So. 37 Jr. 7 Sr. N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	Yes 1 No -	E.O.F., educational foundation program	70 10 71 26 72 34	Adm. off., summer pro. (reading, speech)	70 N/A 71 8 72 24	P.R. civilization, ESL, others	Yes 1	N/A	All Federal programs, scholarship loans	Yes ✓ No -
H	3,350	70 35 71 100 72 150	Fr. 70 So. 66 Jr. 33 Sr. 40	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 0	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	Yes 3 No -	E.O.P. academic foundation, summer pro.	70 N/A 71 51 72 68	Adm. off., students, faculty, E.O.F.	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	P.R. studies	Yes 3	109	EOG, HEF, NDEL, work study, 1	Yes 1 No -
I	11,366	70 10 71 N/A 72 12	Fr. 12 So. 6 Jr. 8 Sr. 7	70 N/A 71 10 72 11	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 7	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 9	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 14	Yes 2 No 1	Project CHANCE	70 3 71 1 72 13	Reading, tutoring, (English)	70 2 71 N/A 72 4	Sociology of Puerto Ricans	Yes	23	HEF, EOG, CWSP, NDEL, State scholarships EOG	Yes - No ✓
J	2,539	70 22 71 24 72 49 73/76	Fr. 60 So. 16 Jr. 0 Sr. 0	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 3 71 2 72 4 73/10	70 19 71 2 72 4 73/10	Yes 1 No -	E.O.F.	70 8 71 10 72 14 73/16	Adm. off., P.R. counsellor, E.O.F. director, & recruiter.	70 6 71 18 72 10 73/12	Spanish courses, E.S.L.	1 (tutor)	18	HEF, EOG, EOG, NDEL, CWS, SEL	Yes 1 No -
K	2,581	70 N/A 71 33 72 23	Fr. 9 So. 7 Jr. 7 Sr. 6	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 8	70 0 71 0 72 0	70 N/A 71 4 72 3	70 N/A 71 29 72 20	Yes 1 No -	E.O.F., talent Search, academic foundation.	70 N/A 71 10 72 12	Talent Search, English, reading, math.	70 N/A 71 11 72 9	P.R. history, Latin Am. history	Yes	60	HEF, EOG, TRS, NDEL	Yes 1 No -
L	6,353	70 36 71 N/A 72 58 73/10	Fr. 46 So. 42 Jr. 2 Sr. 11	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 5	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 5	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A 73/6	71 N/A 72 62 73 33	Yes 1 No -	E.O.F., modified general adm. pro.	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A 73/10	E.O.F., adm. off., summer pro., tutorial	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 96	History of Puerto Rico	6	86	HEF, NDEL, EOG, SEOG, work study	Yes 1 No -
M	2,500	70 N/A 71 5 72 10	Fr. 5 So. 1 Jr. 0 Sr. 5	70 0 71 0 72 2	70 0 71 0 72 0	70 0 71 5 72 8	70 0 71 0 72 2	Yes 1 No -	E.O.F., provisional adm.	70 0 71 0 72 0	Skills Acquisition Center	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	No courses	Yes	8	NSG, NDEL, EOG, EOG, CWSP	Yes - No ✓
N	4,801	70 43 71 74 72 88	Fr. 53 So. 33 Jr. 0 Sr. 0	70 3 71 3 72 3	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	Yes 1 No -	Trio pro., 2nd Chance, 100 to coll. Open door.	70 5 71 10 72 21	P.R. counselor, courses in math, writing, reading.	70 7 71 11 72 22	History of P.R., intermediate Spanish	8	64	HEF, EOG, NDEL, EOG, work study, foundation funds	Yes 1 No -
O	3,580	70 26 71 40 72 61	Fr. 42 So. 19 Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	70 5 71 9 72 5	70 0 71 1 72 4	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	Yes - No 0	E.O.F., guest., Rev. dev. pro.	70 4 71 6 72 16	E.O.F., E.S.L., tutoring.	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	Puerto Rican Heritage	Yes	25	HEF, NDEL, CWSP, NDEL, Guaranteed loans	Yes 1 No -

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

High Schools	Total Enrollment	Spanish-Speaking enrollees	Freshmen Sophomores Juniors Seniors	Graduated Students (Spanish)	Dropout Figures	Students in Institutes of Higher Education	Spa. Sp. enrolled in coll. prep.	Non-College prep Curriculum	% Spa. Sp. at grade level-reading	G.E.D. program	Spa. Sp. G.E.D Enrollees	Adult Basic Ed. Prog.	Spa. Sp. Adl Prog Enrollees	Counselors for Spa. Sp. Students	Spa. Sp. students sessions with college reps.	Informed Spa. students re: Adult prog. available	Informed Spa. Sp. re: financial aid proj
A	1,848	'70 N/A '71 227 '72 357	Fr. 145 So. 143 Jr. 60 Sr. 64	'70 14 '71 12 '72 28	'70 N/A '71 27 '72 27	'70 6 '71 9 '72 24	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	Yes	N/A	No	-	Yes-1	Yes	Yes	Yes
B	2,267	'70 374 '71 438 '72 470	Fr. 182 So. 138 Jr. 100 Sr. 69	'70 36 '71 56 '72 69	'70 4 '71 9 '72 12	'70 14 '71 17 '72 18	'70 12 '71 20 '72 29	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	Yes	50%	Yes	60%	Yes-1	Yes	Yes	Yes
C	2,720	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 218	Fr. N/A So. 113 Jr. 91 Sr. 62	'70 15 '71 26 '72 30	'70 N/A '71 55 '72 99	'70 9 '71 15 '72 14	Multi-Track	Multi-Track	So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	Yes	100%	Yes	N/A	No-0	Yes	Yes	Yes
D	3,029	'70 130 '71 146 '72 189	Fr. N/A So. 110 Jr. 60 Sr. 41	'70 48 '71 60 '72 82	'70 15 '71 17 '72 14	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 25	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 70	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 90	So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	Yes	3%	Yes	2%	Yes-2	Yes	Yes	Yes
E	1,850	'70 500 '71 550 '72 600	Fr. 200 So. 150 Jr. 125 Sr. 125	'70 75 '71 75 '72 100	'70 68 '71 65 '72 72	'70 45 '71 40 '72 53	'70 200 '71 200 '72 250	70 300 71 350 72 350	So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	Yes	50%	Yes	75%	No-0	Yes	Yes	Yes
F	1,918	'71 92 '72 92 '73 132	Fr. 60 So. 36 Jr. 17 Sr. 18	'70 N/A '71 9 '72 12	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 12	'70 N/A '71 5 '72 6	Open curriculum	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	So. 7% Jr. 5% Sr. 6%	Yes	31%	Yes	62%	Yes-1	Yes	Yes	Yes
G	2,900	'69 263 '70 N/A '71 561 '72 630 '73 609	Fr. 80 So. 210 Jr. 205 Sr. 115	'70 48 '71 94 '72 106	'70 32 '71 52 '72 51 '73 53	'70 23 '71 38 '72 58	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 N/A	70 N/A 71 N/A 72 N/A	So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	Yes	N/A	Yes	N/A	No-0	Yes	Yes	Yes
H	1,700	'70 32 '71 49 '72 57	Fr. 27 So. 16 Jr. 15 Sr. 3	'70 1 '71 4 '72 6	'70 0 '71 0 '72 4	'70 0 '71 4 '72 4	'70 11 '71 16 '72 18	'70 1 '71 4 '72 4	So. 0 Jr. 1% Sr. 0	No	N/A	No	N/A	No-0	Yes	Yes	Yes
I	1,516	'70 223 '71 250 '72 316	Fr. N/A So. 126 Jr. 74 Sr. 70	'70 29 '71 37 '72 36	'70 27 '71 29 '72 34	'70 21 '71 25 '72 30	'70 115 '71 130 '72 163	'70 108 '71 120 '72 153	So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	No	N/A	No	N/A	Yes-2	Yes	Yes	Yes
J	1,374	'71 529 '72 559 '73 557	Fr. N/A So. 209 Jr. 166 Sr. 154	'70 N/A '71 88 '72 N/A	'71 52 '72 68 '73 71	'70 56 '71 47 '72 N/A	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 N/A	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 N/A	So. 25% Jr. 40% Sr. 46%	No	N/A	Yes	N/A	No-0	Yes	Yes	Yes
K	2,700	'70 368 '71 449 '72 615	Fr. 240 So. 186 Jr. 107 Sr. 77	'70 44 '71 50 '72 58	'70 74 '71 71 '72 128	'70 17 '71 33 '72 38	'70 139 '71 178 '72 260	'70 229 '71 271 '72 355	So. 1% Jr. 2% Sr. 2%	No	-	No	-	Yes-2	Yes	Yes	Yes
L	3,044	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 N/A	Fr. 12 So. 7 Jr. 12 Sr. 12	'70 N/A '71 N/A '71 N/A	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 N/A	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 N/A	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 N/A	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 N/A	So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	Ye	10%	Yes	30%	No-0	Yes	Yes	Yes
M	2,899	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 50 '73 101	Fr. 52 So. 21 Jr. 16 Sr. 12	'70 0 '71 1 '72 7	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 7	'70 N/A '71 1 '72 1	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 6	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 44	So. 3% Jr. 16% Sr. 40%	Yes	16%	Yes	12%	Yes-1	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	2,200	'70 26 '71 56 '72 87	Fr. 48 So. 14 Jr. 17 Sr. 18	'70 4 '71 13 '72 5	'70 8 '71 12 '72 19	'70 2 '71 8 '72 4	'70 14 '71 24 '72 38	'70 12 '71 32 '72 49	So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	Yes	-	Yes	-	No-0	Yes	Yes	Yes
O	1,408	'71 N/A '72 53 '73 65	Fr. 30 So. 12 Jr. 13 Sr. 10	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 10	'71 N/A '72 6 '73 N/A	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 35	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 40	'70 N/A '71 N/A '72 13	So. N/A Jr. N/A Sr. N/A	Yes	- Evening	Yes	- Evening	Yes-2	Yes	Yes	Yes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6c

5). Unfortunately, it is unclear as to who initiated said communication. The question asked: "While in high school did you ever write or talk to a college official about going to his or her college?"

Table Five

College Information While In High School

	#	%
Yes	117	57.6
No	86	42.4
Total, responses	203(3)	100.0

Question 35 answers the question as to the source and/or sources for "counseling and information to assist you to enter college (or who recruited you)?"

Table 6 indicates that of those students who had received counseling and information, the rank order of the sources were first colleges, then high school counselors, followed by community organizations. More than one out of every five (2%) students indicated that they had received no counseling support

3. "Don't knows" and "no responses" omitted for statistical purposes.

and/or recruitment assistance whatsoever.

Table Six

Counseling Information And Assistance

	#	%
1. High school counselor	46	23.0
2. College out-reach	55	27.5
3. Community organization	35	17.5
4. None	44	22.0
5. 1 & 2	16	8.0
6. 1 & 3	2	1.0
7. 2 & 3	2	1.0
Total, responses	200	100.0

The import, analysis and evaluation of above and subsquent data are to be found in the Executive Summary chapter.

2. Are Spanish-speaking students receiving adequate counseling regarding the pursuit of higher education?

More than one out of every two (52.2%) students polled responded affirmatively to the question: "During your high school years, did you feel you could get to see a counselor when you wanted or needed to?" Four out of every ten (41.9%) said "no", with 5.9 percent indicating no counselor present (see table 7).

Table Seven

Availability Of High School Counselor

	#	%
Yes	106	52.2
No	85	41.2
No Counselor	12	5.9
Total, responses	203	100.0

As to "how many times did you talk to a counselor in your last year of high school?", more than one out of every five (21.7%) students indicated "never" while 36.0 percent indicated four or more times (see table 3).

Table Eight

Number Of Counselor Contact Final Year

	#	%
Never	44	21.7
Once	35	17.2
Two or three times	51	25.1
Four or five times	32	15.8
Six or more times	41	20.2
Total, responses	203	100.0

While the availability and the number of counselor contacts is not uniform for all students, over seven out of every ten (71.4%) of the polled college students indicated that they received encouragement from either "teacher or counselor" for "further training after high school" (see table 9).

Table Nine

Encouragement For Post High School Training

	#	%
Yes, college	111	54.7
Yes, tech. school	14	6.9
Yes, business training	11	5.4
Yes, other	9	4.4
No	58	28.6
Total, responses	203	100.0

Fourteen of the fifteen researched colleges reported the presence of specific counselors as staff persons to assist Hispanic students (see tables 2-and 3). Two colleges reported the presence of three such counselors, three colleges reported two counselors, and the remaining nine colleges one each. When a specific counselor is present, the ratio of counselor to Hispanic students tends to be one per one hundred or less. College F with 330 students and one counselor is the exception.

Twelve Spanish-surnamed counselors (presumably Spanish speaking) were reported as employed by the high schools (15) participating in our study. However, not all schools are doing equally well in providing this service for their students. High school "D" has two counselors to serve 189; that is, one Spanish-surname counselor for approximately every 95 Spanish-speaking students. On the other hand we have high school "E" where there are 600 Spanish-speaking students and no Spanish-surname counselors.

By and large, the school that has done the most in this regard has been school "O" which employs two Spanish-surname counselors to work specifically with the Spanish-speaking students, of which they are only 53. That is one counselor for every 27 Spanish-speaking students (see table 4).

All the high schools involved in the study indicated that they are assisting their students in furthering their education. There was a one hundred percent (100%) "yes" reply to the question "Are you arranging meetings for your Spanish-speaking students with college recruiters?" An equal response was accorded to inquiries on the availabilities of assistance on financial aid concerns and special admissions programs. That is, all high schools responded "yes" to questions pertaining to these areas. Note: See chapter on Community Organizations for additional and related information.

3. Was adequate academic preparation provided to Spanish-Speaking students to enter college?

While 56.7% of the students were conditionally accepted to college via a special admissions program (see table 10); only 6.9% indicated that they were below average "in comparison with the other students in your class?" (see table 11).

Table Ten

Conditional Acceptance

	#	%
Yes	114	56.7
No	87	43.3
Total, responses	201	100.0

Table Eleven

Grade, Self Evaluation

	#	%
Among top students (A, B)	74	36.6
Average (C)	114	56.5
Below average (D, F)	14	6.9
Total, responses	202	100.0

Of those students who were conditionally accepted to college via a special admissions program, 50.8 percent indicated that che had to attend a summer program while 24.2 percent had to "attend-on-credited courses" (see table 12).

Table Twelve

Types Of Conditional Acceptance

	#	%
Summer program	63	50.8
Non-credited courses	30	24.2
Other	31	25.0
Total, responses	124	100.0

As to the effectiveness of the services provided in assisting the conditionally accepted students in "overcoming academic deficiences", 56.2% of the polled students positively responded (see table 13) and 52.6% rated the programs as either considerably or extremely effective "in preparing you for your credited courses" (see table 14).

Table Thirteen

Programs Were Of Assistance

	#	%
Yes	77	56.2
No	60	43.8
Total, responses	137	100.0

Table Fourteen

Effectiveness In Academic Assistance

	#	%
Extremely effective	18	13.3
Considerably effective	53	39.3
Slightly effective	34	25.2
Ineffective	30	22.2
Total, responses	135	100.0

The college student respondents, as a group, were highly motivated in the pursuit of a higher education. Seventy three (73) out of 206 respondents (35.4%) replied that, while still in high school, they had aspired to attend graduate school and; sixty

(60) of the respondents (29.1%) had hoped to attend a four-year college while still in high school. Only eleven (11) of the 206 respondents (5.3%) had the completion of high school as their highest, formal, educational goal. Similarly, when questioned about their desired academic performance, the respondents, as a group, desired to achieve the highest level possible.

One hundred and seventeen (117) out of the total 206 respondents (56.8%) indicated that they desired to be "above average" students. Eighty six (86) of all respondents (41.7%) aspired to be "average" students in college. Only one (1) respondent (.5%) indicated that he was "not interested" in the level of his academic performance.

While the above data on the respondents' motivation is of a subjective nature, more "objective" type of data confirms these responses. For example, ninety nine (99) out of the 206 responding students (48%) were enrolled in some kind of college preparatory curriculum while in high school. Fifty five (55) respondents out of the total 206 (29%), were enrolled in a general education curriculum while in high school. Only forty seven (47) respondents, of the total 206 (23%), were enrolled in a terminal program (commercial, vocational, etc.) while in high school.

The overwhelming majority of the respondents indicated that they had selected their curriculum program freely. Only thirty

nine (39) of the respondents (18.9%) had been assigned by the high school authorities to the curriculum program in which they had concerntrated, while 157 of the total 206 respondents (76.2%) indicated they had chosen freely. The remainder attended schools in which there was only one curricular concentration available.

Lending further support to the high motivation of the respondents in pursuing a higher education, are their grade averages while in high school. Thirty nine (39) out of 204 who provided this information (13.9%) reported their overall high school grade average as "A"; eighty three (40.3%) reported their grade average from high school to be "B"; sixty nine (33.5%) reported their overall grade average upon high school completion to be "C." Thus, we have that 59.2% of the respondents graduated from high school with a scholastic average of B or higher.

In further developing the profile of Hispanics who are attending college, we see that in addition to the high self-motivational factor, respondents describe a pattern of support and encouragement, on the part of others, for their educational goals. Thus, we have for example, parental expectations (see table 15).

Table Fifteen

"Parental Expectation on Academic Performance"

	Parental Expectation			
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Does Not Matter
Mother	49%	44.7%	2.9%	3.4%
Father	52%	34.8%	4%	9.2%

The respondents' perception of their parental expectations indicated that Hispanics who attend college tend to come from homes where high goals are set for the children. Unfortunately, we do not have a control population, (Hispanics who did not pursue a college education) to determine whether this high level of parental expectation is common to most of the Hispanic population or is it a situation particular only to those who pursue a higher education.

4. Is information about financial assistance programs made available to the Spanish-speaking students? Is assistance adequate to make higher education an achievable goal?

More than eight out of every ten of the polled Hispanic college students were receiving some form of financial assistance (see table 16). Financial aid information was received primarily from college and high school counselors, singly or in combination with community organizations continuing to play a significant role (see table 17).

As to how the students financed their education: scholarship grants, loans, and work-study programs, either singly or in combination, were the primary sources (see table 18). Parents, either singly or in combination, accounted for but 10.4 percent of the students' sources for financing their education.

Work study programs and part-time employment, either singly or in combinations, involved more of our students polled, as to the type of financial aid and support they were receiving, followed by E.O.F., loans, and E.O.G. grants (see table 19).

More than six out of every ten (65.1%) students polled indicated satisfaction with assistance (see table 20); and 57.0 percent indicated overall satisfaction with the colleges' academic as well as financial assistance efforts (see table 21).

Table Sixteen

Receiving Financial Assistance

	#	%
Yes	162	80.6
No	39	19.4
Total	201	100.0

Table Seventeen

Source of Financial Aid Information

	#	%
1. High School Counselor	33	17.3
2. College Officer	49	25.6
3. Community Organization	19	9.9
4. College Recruiter	20	10.4
5. Other	39	20.3
1 & 2	13	6.8
1 & 3	2	1.0
1 & 4	1	.5
1 & 5	4	2.1
2 & 3	4	2.1
2 & 4	2	1.0
2 & 5	2	1.0
3 & 4	2	1.0
3 & 5	1	.5
More than two	1	.5
Total	192	100.0

Table Eighteen

Financing Education

	#	%
1. Bank Loan	18	8.9
2. Private scholarship	3	1.5
3. State scholarship	36	17.7
4. Work	14	6.9
5. Parents, relative	11	5.4
6. Other	51	25.1
1 & 3	2	1.0
1 & 4	12	5.9
1 & 5	3	1.5
1 & 6	8	3.9
2 & 6	1	.5
3 & 4	4	2.0
3 & 5	1	.5
3 & 6	1	.5
4 & 5	6	3.0
4 & 6	5	2.5
More than two	27	13.2
Total	203	100.0

Table Nineteen

Type Of Financial Aid

	#	%
1. Educational Opportunity Fund (EOF)	31	16.9
2. Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG)	3	1.6
3. Work Study	7	3.8
4. National Defense Student Loan	7	3.8
5. Other	32	17.6
1 & 2	10	5.5
1 & 3	3	1.6
1 & 4	16	8.8
1 & 5	2	1.1
2 & 3	4	2.2
2 & 4	1	.5
2 & 5	7	3.8
3 & 4	2	1.1
3 & 5	52	28.5
4 & 5	1	.5
More than two	5	2.7
Total, responses	183	100.0

Table Twenty

Has Assistance Been Satisfactory

	#	%
Yes	121	65.1
No	65	34.9
Total, responses	186	100.0

Table Twenty one

Overall Satisfaction with College Assistance

	#	%
Yes	110	57.0
No	83	43.0
Total, responses	193	100.0

5. What are the academic, social, and family commonalities among currently enrolled Spanish-speaking students?

The median age of the college students is twenty years. One hundred and twenty six (126) of our total sample of 206 were born in Puerto Rico (61.2%). Fifty five (55) were born in the mainland (26.7%), and twenty five (25) were born outside of the United States (12.1%). In the two latter categories, at least one parent of the respondent was born in Puerto Rico.

The average respondent has lived in the mainland an average of 17 years. One hundred and forty three of the 205 responding to this question (69.7%) have lived in the mainland at least

10 years; only 20 respondents (9.7%) have lived in the mainland for less than five years. Thus, we have a population that has been exposed to American mainland culture for the larger part of their life. However, Spanish was considered the predominant language of the majority of the respondents.

One hundred and thirty six (136) considered Spanish their predominant language (60%) out of 206 respondents. English was considered the predominant language of sixty (60) respondents (29.1%). Six considered themselves equally proficient in English and Spanish.

The use of Spanish as the main language of intercourse is even higher within the household. One hundred and sixty five (165) of the totality of respondents reported Spanish as the primary language used within their households (80.1%); twenty two (22) listed English as the main language in their households (10.7%); and, eighteen (18) listed their households as bilingual (8.7%); in one household, neither Spanish or English was the main language of communication.

One hundred and thirty eight (138), of the 204 respondents, are still living in the parental household (67.6%); of those who left the parental household, 26 are married (13%); two are divorced (1%); and, seven are separated (3.4%). The remainder have established independent households. The average respondent comes from a household which contains five persons. Forty of two hundred and four (204) respondents lived in this "typical" household (19.4%); 38 respondents lived in households which contained 4 persons (18.4%); households of 3 members were

reported by 29 respondents (14.1%); and, 25 replies indicated the respondents came from households of only 2 members (12.1%). The remainder of the respondents came from those that had only one member of households that contained 20 members. Thirty one respondents report only one brother or sister of two hundred and four (204) responses (15%); thirty three had three siblings (16.6%); and 30 had two siblings (14.7%). The remaining responses range from one sibling reported, to nine siblings reported. Thus, the responses indicate a median 3.6 siblings per respondent.

Regarding the siblings, 35 respondents reported that they had at least one older brother or sister (17%); while thirty six had two older brothers and/or sisters (17.5%); the remaining responses ranged from reporting no older sibling (37%) to eleven older siblings (1%). Thus, we have that 63% percent of those responding come from families in which they (respondents) are not the oldest offsprings.

A substantial numbers of these responding indicated that they had at least one older sibling who failed to complete high school. Thirty of 202 respondents (14.8%) reported no older siblings failing to complete high school. The remainder, discounting those that had no older siblings, reported from one (42 respondents) to eleven (2 respondents) siblings as not completing high school. That is to say, of the 128 respondents who have older siblings, 98 reported at least one older sibling failing to get any high school diploma (76.5%).

The educational level of the respondents' parents is, generally, less than high school. Of 205 respondents, who reported on the level of their mothers education, 108 indicated that they had between 1 and 8 years of schooling (52.6%); 51 indicated that their mothers had some high school (24.8%); 18 indicated that their mothers had attended college (8.7%); and, 11 reported their mothers had received no formal education (5.3%). The remaining respondents were not aware of the level of their mothers' education. The level of education for the average respondents' mother is, then, less than high school.

The fathers of the respondents have a similar educational background. Forty six percent have from 1 to 8 years of schooling; 29.9% have some high school; 7.4% have some college; and, the fathers of 3.9% of the respondents have no formal education. The extent of formal education received by the father of the average respondents is, as is that of the mothers, less than high school.

Not surprisingly, the main wage earner in the respondents' household is usually a factory worker or employed in an un skilled or semi-skilled position within the service sector. Of 97 respondents who provided us with this information, 46 (47.4%) listed the main wage earner occuaption as "factory worker." Only 10.3% reported the main wage earner's occupation as "para-professional" (teacher aides, case worker aides, dental assistant, etc.). Only 2.1% of the respondents reported the main wage earner's occupation to be "professional." Skilled workers are also low among the reported occupations.

Only 3.1% of the respondents indicated electricians; 1% were listed as painters; and, 31.% were listed as drivers. The total number of wage earners who could be classified as "skilled workers," according to the responses received, represented 13.4% of the sample.

Given the low incomes available in the employment categories in which the average "main provider" of the respondents' households is engaged, it is, again not surprising, that in many cases, the mother must work. Out of 202 responses received, the father was reported to be the main wage earner in one hundred and nine (109) of the cases (54%). The mother was listed as the main wage earner by 44 respondents (21.8%); forty nine respondents (24.3% listed "other" as the main wage earner. That is, neither the father or the mother was the main wage earner in that household. If we discount those mothers who are reported as "main wage" earners, from the total number of mothers who work either full or part-time outside of the household, we have 50 mothers who work to supplement the income of the "main wage earner." That is to say, in 31.6% of those households in which the main wage earner is someone other th the mother, she must work to supplement the household income In 60% of those cases, where she brings supplementary income into the household, she does so by working on a full-time basis.

Table Twenty Two

Income Range Distribution for Families of Hispanic Students Enrolled in New Jersey Colleges and Universities as Compared to the State's Puerto Rican Population

Yearly Income	College Respondents	Puerto Ricans in State(4)
Less than 4,000	20.5%	24.1%
4,000 to 6,000	21.0%	21.3%
6,000 to 8,000	27.9%	18.0%
8,000 to 10,000	29.5%	12.5%
over 10,000	1.1%	24.1%

4. United States Census - 1970

B. Additional Data

6. The Community Organizations

The community organization directors were interviewed in order to determine the extent of their involvement in recruiting, counseling and/or other involvement with the TRIO programs.

The Respondents:

Administrators of each of the 13 community-based New Jersey agencies, each serving predominately Spanish-speaking communities were researched by Raúl Vicente, Assistant Project Director, and his cadre of trained interviewers. Two agencies originally intended to be included are reported to be no longer functioning.

Following are the findings with respect to the scope of project:

1. Recruiting Services

The 13 agencies were asked whether they serve as recruiters of students for TRIO in their areas (question #14); two agencies (15%) responded affirmatively, eleven (85%) negatively.

The same two agencies responded that they have recommended students to TRIO Programs. One reported that all their recommendations were accepted.

The same agency reported that they approached TRIO about the need for recruiting more Hispanic students to the program. Both agencies reported that at least one student they recommended has been accepted by a TRIO project. The other agency did noy know

if any of their recommended students had been rejected, nor whether a majority had been accepted.

As to whether TRIO is helpful, occasionally helpful, or unconcerned about aiding the student "you recommend" in making it to college, one of the two agencies which reported making recommendations reported that TRIO was "helpful when help is requested," the other agency making recommendations did not respond, and two other agencies reported that TRIO was "unconcerned..."

Three agencies reported that they "offered... assistance" to TRIO in their efforts to communicate with the Hispanic community. Another agency responded that they never heard of TRIO, a fifth "was never contacted," and the remainder answered in the negative.

2. Counseling

Agencies were all asked whether they believed TRIO follows up with its students after they have been admitted to the program. The agency which reported that all of its students were accepted were "not sure," the other whose recommendation was accepted "can not determine," three agencies responded in the negative, and the remainder did not know.

The agency whose recommendations were all accepted reported that TRIO "sometimes" sought its assistance in following up with a student admitted into the program. The other whose recommendation was accepted was one of eight programs responding negatively. The remainder said or implied the question was not applicable.

3. Administration of HEW's TRIO Programs

The remainder of the questionnaire bears upon the extent to which these representative community organizations serving Spanish speaking communities throughout New Jersey have (a) been acquainted with and (b) been involved with TRIO-funded projects.

The Summary of Responses follows:

1. Four of the 13 agencies (30.8%) reported acquaintanceship with Talent Search; three of 12 agencies (25%) reported acquaintance with Upward Bound and with Special Services.

2. Four agencies (30.8%) reported they were generally acquainted with the purposes of TRIO; a fifth reported acquaintance solely with the purpose of Upward Bound.

3. Queried about awareness of functions, three each were acquainted with Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Special Services; though this represented positive responses for at least one from five different agencies.

4. Two agencies reported having been visited by a TRIO project, one each via "another agency" and college, and one found about TRIO via "another manner."

5. Three agencies (23.1%) reported being contacted by a TRIO Project; four agencies reported contacting TRIO.

6. Two agencies reported receiving information from TRIO "regularly," one "sporadically," the other 10 (76.9%), "never."

7. No agency reported knowing any TRIO Program Board of Director member from their community or nearest college. None was ever invited to nominate anyone for membership on a TRIO Board of Directors.

8. Two agencies (15.5%) had at some time been invited to a TRIO meeting. Both attended at least one.

9. None knew of any Hispanic members in a TRIO Board of Directors, nor had approached the TRIO Program about the need for Hispanic representatives on their Board of Directors.

10. In dealings with TRIO officials, one agency found TRIO helpful when help is requested, one agency found TRIO, "occasionally helpful," two found TRIO, "unconcerned," and the remainder had no relations.

11. Three agencies reported that at least one TRIO Project "properly explained their procedure and requirements" to them. Only one agency reported having sought such an explanation, though a second agency reported they had not, because they were "frustrated."

12. Of the five agencies which reported themselves acquainted with TRIO, one "would not determine" whether TRIO Program staff members appeared knowledgeable about Hispanic culture and language the remainder were like all others which were not acquainted - they did not know - except for one, which responded that they were not.

13. TRIO staff members "appear to make an effort to communicate with Hispanic persons: "sometimes" to one agency, "no" to four others, with the remainder not knowing or not answering.

14. Overall, agencies' impression of TRIO was:

Good	- 1
Fair	- 1
Indifferent	- 5
No basis	- 6

7. The High Schools

The high schools (15) reported a total of 33, 373 students in 1972. Thirteen percent (13%) or 4,293 of these students are Hispanic (see table 4).

The Hispanic student population in 1972 represented an average increase of about twenty percent (20%) over that which was reported for the 1971 school year. The latter, in turn, represented an increase of about seventeen percent (17%) over the Hispanic student population that was reported for the 1970 school year. Thus we have, from student population data which was made available (B, D, E, H, I, K, N) for all three years (seven out of the fifteen high schools), an average growth rate of approximately 18.5% per annum for the Hispanic high school student population. This contrasts with the total New Jersey high school student population growth rate which in the '70-'71 school year was than one percent (0.9%) and which did not increase (0%) during the '71-'72 school year.(5)

In contrast to this high growth rate, the Hispanic student population also manifests a high rate of attrition The reported rate of attrition (dropout) was twelve (12%) percent in the

5. Office of Program and Management, New Jersey Department of Education

1970-1971 school year. During the 1971-1972 school year, this figure decreased to ten percent (10%). By the 1972-1973 school year, the dropout rate apparently had increased again to twelve percent (12%). That is, at least one out of every eight Hispanic students who enter high school in the State of New Jersey leave school before graduating, based on the above reported information. This rate of attrition for Hispanic students is approximately three times greater than the official attrition rate for all students.[6]

Despite this high dropout rate, the number of Hispanics going on to pursue a college education has been steadily increasing. In those high schools (A, B, C, E, G, I, J, and N) which presented data on Spanish-speaking graduates going on to college for all three years, the reported numbers were 137 for 1970, 185 for 1971, and 239 for 1972. This represents a 74% growth rate, from 1970 to 1972, of Spanish-speaking graduates going on to institutions of higher learning. It should be noted that the data furnished either by the high schools or the colleges does not delineate the root and branch for the increasing numbers of Spanish-speakers who are going on to college.

Despite the increasing number of Hispanics pursuing a higher education, we still find that the largest number of Spanish-speaking high school students are enrolled in non-college preparatory curriculum even in high schools which provide both college preparatory and non-college preparatory curriculum. High school

---

6. ibid

B, with four hundred and seventy (470) Spanish-speaking students, reported 29 or 6% as enrolled in a college preparatory curriculum.

In the high schools (E, H, I, K, and N) which presented comparative data on Hispanic students enrolled in non-college preparatory curriculum vis-á-vis Spanish-speaking enrollment for the three years, the reported numbers were 650 out of 1,149 or 57% in 1970, 777 out of 1,354 or 57% for 1971, and 911 out of 1,675 or 54% for 1972. Only three high schools reported more Hispanic students enrolled in college preparatory curriculums. These were schools H, I, and D. It should be noted that these schools are located in the most urbanized areas of New Jersey, areas in which Spanish-speaking people represent a significant segment of the total population.

Since independent reading skills is the single most important academic tool that a college student must possess in order to be successful, one of the concerns of this study is the level of reading compentency of Spanish-speaking students acquired in New Jersey Public high schools.

Only five (5) of the fifteen (15) high schools replied ully to the question, "What percentage of the Spanish-speaking students are reading at their grade level"; the response ranged from 0% in the sophomore and senior grades of school "H" to 46% in the senior grade of school "J". All other schools replied that the information was "not available."

It should be ponted out that where G.E.D. and Adult Basic Education is available Spanish-speaking enrollment is considerable

8. The Colleges

Due to the incompleteness and inadequacy of reported data, it is difficult to make a valid determination as to the magnitude of Hispanics who are dropping out of college. For example, only nine of the reporting colleges presented numbers for Hispanics who dropped out in 1972, the data is also incomplete for the other years. Unfortunately, we did not ask questions about students on "academic warning and probation," "incomplete grades" or students who had/had not earned degrees after four years of full time course work.

Hence, the available and presented data on dropouts must be viewed with extreme caution. In 1970, four colleges reported 50 Spanish-speaking students as dropouts. These colleges had 182 Hispanics enrolled in 1970 hence this represents a dropout rate of 29%. In 1971, 56 students were reported as dropping out from six institutions with a total enrollment of 319 Hispanics for a drop-out percentage of 17%. In 1972, 58 students were reported as dropping out from nine colleges with a total enrollment of 7 7 Spanish-speaking students for a dropout percentage of 8%.

In 1971, one of the fifteen reporting colleges indicated that 1 Hispanic graduate had matriculated for graduate study; a year later the number jumped to 40. As the 1970 Census indicates that 4% of Puerto Ricans are employed as "professional, technical, and kindred workers," or one half the rate for blacks (8%) so employed and one-fourth continental whites (17%) so situated and trained,

it is clear that colleges and graduate schools must increase the out-put of trained Hispanics if a significant professional base is to be developed and realized in this community. While the need for a professional base is particularly crucial to Puerto Ricans(7 it must be noted that the overwhelming majority of other Hispanic professionals received their professional training outside of New Jersey and the Continental United States.

The extent of Spanish-speaking students concentrating in the social sciences appear to be largely determined by the particular institution that they are attending as oppossed to a generalized affinity or interest for this concentrated coursework. For examp all of the students (231) enrolled at college B were matriculating as non-social science students in 1972. This is contrasted with the evidence provided by colleges E, F, I, and M which reported 364 out of the 471 enrolled Hispanic students in 1972 to have a social science concentration for an average of 77%. Of the other reporting institutions, either the information was not available or much more mixed as to program concentration.

Fourteen of the fifteen colleges reported the presence of specific counselors as staff persons to assist Hispanic stu ents. Two colleges reported the presence of three such counselors thre colleges reported two counselors, and the remaining nine colleges one each. When a specific counselor is present, the ratio of

7. At the time this report is being prepared, the following numb of Puerto Rican professionals living in New Jersey are known to this agency: two (2) M.D.s; four (4) lawyers; six (6) social workers (M.S.W.s); and ten (10 Ph.Ds.

counselor to Hispanic students tends to be one per one hundred or less. College F with 330 students and one counselor is the exception. The bilingual capability of these counselors is undetermined.

In those institutions which afforded us comparative data, the number of Spanish-speaking students enrolled under a special admission program increased 4% from 1970 (56%) to 1972 (60%). Eight colleges presented data on both Spanish-speaking special enrollment vis-á-vis Spanish-speaking enrollment for 1970 (188/336); ten colleges reported 598 students out of 1,001 similarly situated in 1972.

Of particular significance is that the available data indicates an increasing number of Spanish-speaking students have completed the requirements of the "special" admissions program and have moved on to the regular college work. For example, in 1970 eight colleges indicated 51 students transfered over as oppossed to the 82 who were admitted under special admissions programs (62%); in 1971 this cross-over increased to 78% (196/153); and in 1972 it increased further to 85% (490/415) for an indicated plus net gain of 23% over the three years. Again, this data must be viewed judiciously and with caution due to the limitations of the questionnaire and the imponderables of incomplete information.

In those institutions which has gathered data on Spanish-speaking students receiving some form of financial assistance and made available to us (12 of 15) at least 834 students or 52% of the total Hispanic enrollment were reportedly so assisted. To make a determination as to the percentage of Hispanic students receiving some form of financial assistance in the twelve colleges which provided data is fraught with problems. For example, college

K reports 23 Hispanics enrolled in 1972 with 60 receiving financial assistance. A total count for the breakdown of matriculation (29) still does not resolve this seemingly cumulative count on financial assistance. Likewise, colleges I and L have comparable problems. Hence, these three colleges are not included in the following calculation: In colleges B, C, E, F, H, J, M N, O, inclusive, 57% or 655 out of the 1164 Spanish-speaking students enrolled are receiving some form of financial assistance. Unfortunately, no breakdown was asked for or received as to the numbers of students receiving specific type(s) of financial aid.

As to the forms of financial assistance reported:

1) Basic education grant opportunity grant - Colleges B, D, E, F, G, I, J, K, M, N, O;
2) College work study - All Colleges;
3) Education opportunity fund grant - Colleges C, D, E, F, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O;
4) Foundation funds - College N;
5) Guarantee funds loan - Colleges B, F, G, J, K, O;
6) National direct student loan - All Colleges;
7) Nursing scholarship - College F;
8) Nursing student loan - College F;
9) Supplementary education opportunity grant - Colleges F, , L, O, B, G;
10) Tuition and grant - College K;
11) University scholarship - College F;

The information reported on special admission programs is woefully incomplete. For example, only college B reported having Upward Bound (TRIO) and yet information provided by the U.S. Office of Education in Washington, D.C., on December 20, 1973, indicates that in addition to B, colleges L, A, C, I and H also received

Upward Bound funding during 71-72 and/or 72-73.

The breakdown reported for special admission programs is as follows:

1) Admissions, general (modified) - L
2) Admissions, open door - N
3) Admissions, provisional - M
4) Admissions, special (Trio) - None
5) Educational Opportunity Fund - All Colleges
6) Education Foundation Program* - G, F, K,
7) One Hundred go to College - N
8) Project Channel - I
9) Quest Program - O
10) Second Chance - N
11) Talent Search (Trio) - K
12) Upward Bound (Trio) - N

* in conjunction with E.O.F. Programs.

9. Demographic Characteristics of Puerto Ricans in New Jersey

The 1970 Census(8) lists the following data about the Puerto Rican Community in New Jersey;

-Puerto Rican families are larger, younger, are overwhelming renters of dwelling space, and live in overcrowded circumstances to a greater extent than is true of any other statistical group ir New Jersey;

-Median family income for Puerto Ricans is 44% less than the family income of Anglo-whites and 17% less than that of black people;

-Per capita income for Puerto Ricans is 57% less than that of whites and 18% less than that of blacks;

-One out of every seven Puerto Rican families lives in extreme poverty; one out of every four families lives in poverty; one out of every three families is either inpoverished or borderline poor; and seven out of every ten families are working poor;

-One out of every four Puerto Rican families is eligible for public assistance; whereas one out of every five families i- receiving public assistance;

-3.2% of employed Puerto Ricans are self-employed; whereas 4.2% of blacks and 10.8% of whites are self-employed;

8. Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census
P C (1) - C 32 New Jersey ('72)
P C (2) - 1 D ('63)

-8.1% of Puerto Ricans receive "other income" (interest, dividends, pensions, etc.); whereas 12.2% of blacks and 42.3% of whites are similarly situated;

-68% of employed Puerto Ricans work in low income-unskilled jobs;

-24% of Puerto Rican mothers of pre-school children are working to supplement husband's income;

-28% of Puerto Rican males 16 to 21 years old and out of school are unemployed;

-Puerto Ricans are dropping out of school at a rate four times that of whites and twice that of blacks;

-Occupationally Puerto Ricans will require 120 years at the present growth rate (1.7% per decade) to achieve the present professional managerial status realized by whites but only if the latter's occuaptional mobility stops in its tracks.

Table Twenty Three

Family Characteristics by Ethnicity (N.J.)

	PUERTO RICANS	BLACKS	WHITES
Mean size	4.3	4.0	3.5
% families with children under 6 years	50.3	34.7	24.3
% female headed	19.1	29.6	9.1
% in owner occupied housing unit	13.2	26.1	61.0
% live in overcrowded circumstances (1.01 or more persons per room)	28.0	20.0	16.0
% lacking some or all plumbing facilities	6.8	4.6	1.8

Table Twenty Four

Economic Characteristics by Ethnicity (N.J.)

	PUERTO RICANS	BLACKS	WHITES
Median family income	$6,459	$7,644	$11,771
Per capita income	$1,807	$2,243	$ 3,869
% family income less than poverty level	24.3	18.9	4.8
% families receiving public assistance	20.0	18.3	3.1
% family income less than 75 percent of poverty level	13.7	11.6	3.1
% family income less than 125 percent of poverty level	34.6	26.6	7.1

Table Twenty Five

Educational Characteristics by Ethnicity (N.J.)

	PUERTO RICANS	BLACKS	WHITES
Median school years completed	8.3	10.5	12.1
% males 16-21 years school dropouts	46.2	25.7	11.6
% persons 18-24 years, not completed high school	70.7	44.0	24.0
% persons 25 years +,			
less than 5 years education	23.4	8.9	4.3
less than 1 year high school	59.7	36.0	27.2
less than 4 years high school	79.6	63.8	45.9
college graduates	2.0	4.1	12.5

Table Twenty Six

Occupation of Employed Persons by Ethnicity (N.J.)

Occupation	% PUERTO RICANS '60 - '70	% BLACKS '70	% WHITES '70
1. Prof., tech., & kindred workers	2.7 - 4.2	8.3	16.7
2. Managers, adm. except farm	2.1 - 2.3	2.2	9.4
3. Sales and Clerical	7.7 -13.2	18.2	28.9
4. Craftsmen	8.2 -11.3	9.3	14.2
5. Operatives, laborers	62.1 -55.2	38.9	20.6
6. Service Workers	10.1 -11.1	22.1	9.5
7. Farmers and Agricultural workers	5.7 - 1.7	.9	.6*
Or socio-economically:			
Middle Class: (#1 & 2)	4.8 - 6.5	10.5	26.7*
Strivers: (#3 & 4)	15.9 -24.5	27.6	43.1
Working Poor: (#5, 6, & 7)	77.9 -68.0	61.9	30.1

* the .6% in category #7 for whites is included among the middle class as they are overwhelming farmers whereas for Puerto Ricans and Blacks they are overwhelming agricultural workers. It must be pointed out that category #7 does not include migrant farmworkers, day haul farmworkers who reside outside of New Jersey, and Puerto Rican contract workers.

Executive Summary: Analysis and Recommendations

Students from low income families (incomes under $9,000) in New Jersey are overwhelmingly enrolled (77%) in the state colleges. Yet, the distribution of federal funds for student aid does not reflect this pattern of income distribution. While 13% of the students in public colleges are receiving funds from federal programs, 19% of those in private college are recipients of such assistance. To put it another way: 26% of the students in private colleges have family incomes under $9,000 - with 19% of all the students enrolled in these private institutions receiving federal student aid; 45% of the students in public colleges similarly situated economically - with 13% of all the students enrolled in these colleges receiving federal assistance. This seems to indicate that 73% of the students with need in the private institutions are receiving some form of federal assistance, whereas, only 29% of those students similarly situated in the public colleges are assisted. Furthermore, the average amount of federal aid per student is greater in the private system ($900) than in the public state system ($671).(9)

In our research sample of fifteen (15) colleges, six (6 have never received any form of TRIO funding - B, E, F, G, M, and O - during the past three years. Of the nine (9) which have had funding, colleges C and I had funding in 71/72 but did not for

9. Based on information provided, New Jersey Department of Higher Education.

the two subsequent years; colleges D and J received their first grant in 73/74; college L had funding for 71/72 and 72/73 but not for 73/74; college N has had funding for the last two academic years; with only colleges A, H, and K receiving TRIO monies for all three years.

This means that 40% of the researched colleges (5/15) have never received TRIO grants; that 33% of those which had received grants were not by the 73/74 academic year; and that only 20% of all the researched colleges had received TRIO grants for all three academic years.

An analysis of TRIO grants awarded to New Jersey institutions of higher learning during the past three years shows private colleges receiving the lion's share of Upward Bound monies with public colleges dominating Special Services monies (see table 27).

Table Twenty Seven

Institution of TRIO Monies by Year, Programming, and Distribution

	'71	'72	'73
Special Service			
public colleges	$290,000 (3)	$300,993 (4)	520,992 (5)
private colleges	100,000 (1)		82,370 (1)
Talent Search			
public colleges	53,000 (1)	49,435 (1)	50,000 (1)
private agencies	42,000 (1)	77,000 (2)	113,000 (2)
Upward Bound			
public colleges	349,203 (4)	351,480 (4)	439,790 (4)
private colleges	531,391 (5)	604,324 (5)	781,467 (7)
public/private colleges	-	-	82,044 (1)
Talent Search/Upward Bound Vets			
public colleges	-	160,000 (2)	82,912 (2)

In order to make at least an indirect determination as to the impact of TRIO programming on Hispanic students, we calculated the differential enrollment of Hispanic students in institutions with TRIO programming contrasted by those without suc student assistance.

Six Colleges (A, C, H, I, K, and L) had TRIO projects operatin in 1971. Only three of these colleges (A, H. and K) reported Hispanic enrollment for this year: 214 for an average of 71 Hispanic students. Of the nine non-TRIO colleges eight (B, D, E, F, J, M, N, and O) reported 486 enrolled or an average Hispanic enrollment of 61 in 1971.

In 1972, five collegew (A, H, K, L, and M) had TRIO funded programs with all reporting on Hispanic enrollment for that year: 605 or an average of 120 Hispanics enrolled. It must be pointed out that two of these colleges had an average enrollment of 225 Hispanics. This is contrasted with the ten institutions without TRIO funding in 1972 (all but G reporting): 993 or an average of 110 Hispanics enrolled. Like those colleges with TRIO funding there was a decided skew among those institutions without: four colleges had a total enrollment of 806 for an average of 202 Hispanic students enrolled.

If you collapse the data and compare those institutions which are at sometime administering TRIO projects versus those colleges without such programming, it is noteworthy to point out that the former colleges report a total Hispanic enrollment of 847 or an

average of 94 in these nine colleges during 1972; the latter colleges, with five reporting, have a combined enrollment of 751 or an average of 150 Hispanics similarly enrolled.

Due to the limited and general "unavailability" of data on Hispanic college dropouts, we are unable to reasonably compute a differential rate as to the presence or non-presence of TRIO programming affecting Hispanic performance.

As could have been expected, due to the nature of TRIO programming, those colleges with TRIO projects reported more counselors for the Spanish-speaking students (a total of 15 for an average of 1.7 per institution), than those without such capability (a total of 7 for an average of 1.2 per institution). This built-in capability is not likewise reflected in the number and presence of Spanish-speaking teachers. For example, of those nine colleges with TRIO support, five reported the presence of a total of 21 such individual (for an average 4 per college), three others responded with a "yes", and one "N/A." The reported data for those colleges without TRIO programs is about the same: three reported a total of 13 such individuals (again 4 per college) and the remaining three responded with "yes."

The 1970 census noted that 55.8% of the continental whites, 43.2% of the blacks, and 46.1% of the Puerto Ricans in New Jersey who were college students were enrolled in private institutions.

Our data suggests, like the data provided by the New Jersey Department of Higher Education for all students, that Puerto Ricans from affluent homes are enrolling in private colleges. For example, the range of family income for our researched Puerto Rican students enrolled in the fifteeen public colleges is lower than the range of Puerto Rican family income reported in the census (see table 28).

Table Twenty Eight

Family Income of Research Puerto Rican Students vs Census Figures

	Students	Census
less than $4,000	20.5%	24.1%
$4,000 to $6,000	21.0%	21.3%
$6,000 to $8,000	27.9%	18.0%
$8,000 to $10,000	29.5%	12.5%
$10,000 or more	1.1%	24.1%

This table indicates two important factors about the educational opportunities available to Puerto Rican college students: 1) Students in public colleges from families in the lowest income category (less than $4,000 - the limited TRIO target population) are enrolled significantly less proportionality to the one out of every four Puerto Rican families that reported a comparable command over economic resources in the 1970 census (20.5% vis-á-vis 24.1%); 2) One out of every five (24.1%) Puerto Rican families reported family income in 1970 to be in excess of $10,000 and yet only 1.1% of our student research sample reported a comparable family income level.

As to the specific policy questions which this research study is to answer:

1. Are the recruiting services of colleges reaching Spanish-speaking students? If yes, which services have been most effective? If not, why.

It must be noted, first of all, that 42.4 percent of the polled college students did not have the benefit of communication with "college officials" while still in high school (see table 5 on page 7). It is unclear if the fact that 57.6 percent did, in light of the ambiguity as to whether the student or the college initiated said communication, positively affirms the above question.

Table 6, which indicates that 27.5 percent of the students received counseling information and recruitment assistance solely from college officials with an additional 8.0 percent receiving same from a combination of high school counselors and college outreach staff, suggests otherwise. Again, a large number of students (22.0%) indicated they had to shift for themselves.

The most significant finding to the question of college recruitment, counseling, and assistance is the, perhaps, unexpectedly significant role that community organizations play (17.5 percent) vis-á-vis their admittedly limited educational resources and non-involvement by the colleges (see chapter 6, pages 26 to 30).

That college recruitment is multi-dimensional, including peer pressure and familial motivations (see chapter 5, pages 20 to 25), is, perhaps, the appropriate answer at this time.

The reported increase of Spanish-speaking college students (see tables 2 and 3), which indicates in 1972 a 250 percent increase over the numbers reported enrolled in 1971 and a 425 percent increase over the 1970 Hispanic enrollment, indubitably suggests the viability of the multiplicity of forces at work here.

This is not to say that the relative progress noted above is absolute progress as to the higher educational opportunities afforded to Hispanics in New Jersey. First of all, demographic factors are not controlled and the reported information in no way permits comparative analysis with other groups in these fifteen colleges over time. Furthermore, that while 1.9% of the students in the responding colleges are reported as Spanish-speaking, in no way do these fifteen researched institutions represent the totality of colleges in New Jersey nor the totality of New Jersey students enrolled in institutions of higher learning either in New Jersey or elsewhere. Hence, if it were possible to determine the absolute number of New Jersey Hispanic college students enrolled in institutions of higher learning, wherever, relative to all New Jersey college students enrolled, it is reasonable to assume that the figure of 1.9% (Hispanic enrollment) would be considerably reduced. With 7%

of New Jersey's population being Hispanic, whatever the real figure is for Hispanic college student enrollment, we can only cautiously affirm that initial progress, as to the educational opportunities available to Hispanic college students and prospective students, is being nominally realized.

Methodological Note: There are three methodological factors for policy indeterminancy:

1. The lack of specificity of reported data and a significan number of "not available" answers; 2). Public institutions in New Jersey, not just high schools and colleges, do not maintain data banks which are readily amenable for program evaluation; 3) The lack of control groups to balance the responses of our matriculating college students. For example, we do not know what the responses of Hispanic high school graduates who are not college students, of Hispanic high school dropouts, nor Hispanic college dropouts would be to the questions about counselor/teacher/recruiter assistance which we posed to our college students. Ergo, even to attempt a discussion about the adequacy of such supportive, counseling and other services is fraught with methodological pitfalls.

2. Are Spanish-speaking students receiving adequate counseling regarding the pursuit of higher education? If yes, by whom? Colleges? High Schools? Community Organizations? Others?

Not withstanding the previously noted factors for indeterminancy, the answer to this question is not clearcut but mixed.

Obviously, for some, the answer is a resounding yes: the 52.2 percent who indicated their high school counselor was available (see table 7); the 36.0 percent who indicated four or more counselor contacts during the senior year (see table 8); and the 71.4 percent who received encouragement from either "teacher or counselor" for "further training after high school" (see table 9).

Unfortunately, for others, supportive high school services were all but non-existant: 41.2 percent indicated the non-availability of their high school counselor (see table 7); 21.7 percent had no counselor contact in their senior year with an additional 42.3 percent reporting three or fewer contacts (see table 8); and 28.6 percent reported no encouragement for post high school training (see table 9).

As we noted earlier, the data furnished by either the high schools or the colleges does not delineate the root and branch for the increased numbers of Spanish-speakers who are going on to college. However, the students' responses does evidence a high degree of individual as well as family motivation for higher education. At this we can at best assume, given the range of responses and available data, that it is a combination of push and pull events (push: individual and family educational aspirations; presence of older sibling dropout

which results in non-economic necessity for immediate employment of the matriculating college student; peer pressure especially of Hispanics already enrolled in colleges; and existing high school and community agency supportive services; pull; peer pressure for enrollment at a specific institution; recruitment and the availability of (financial assistance) explaining the numbers of Hispanic college students presently enrolled in the fifteen public institutions in New Jersey.

3. Was adequate academic preparation provided to Spanish-speaking students to enter college?

In 1972 there were 1,240 Hispanic students enrolled in the twelve colleges (B, C, D, E, F, H, I, J, K, M, N, and O) which provided comparative data on both Spanish-speaking enrollment and the number of Spanish-speakers enrolled in special admissions programs. Out of the 1,240 Hispanics enrolled, 50.3% or 624 were enrolled in some sort of special admissions program. The magnitude of one out of every students requiring such compensatory programming militates against a positive affirmation to the above question. It should, however, also be noted, as pointed out earlier, that a number of financial aid and recruitment programs do require the participation of students in various programming regardless of real need or not. Herewithin, perhaps explains the dichotomy of 59% of the Hispanic students reporting a high school average of B or better with the 50% enrolled in special admissions programs.

In light of the federal statistics on Puerto Rican school dropouts in New Jersey (see table 25, on page 42); the reported dropout rate of one out of every eight Hispanic students that enter high school in the state of New Jersey leave school before graduating (see page 32); the moderately high reported college attrition rate of Hispanics (see page 34); and the imponderables of available data (see page 51), it is clear that those Spanish-speaking students who are matriculating at a college level are able to do so inspite of the general educational opportunities afforded to Spanish-speaking youngsters in New Jersey.

If anything, the polled students' responses indicate that the various college level counseling, assistance, and remedial programs (see tables 10-14, on pages 12-13) were of significance to at least a simple majority: 52.6 percent rated the college programs as either considerably or extremely effective "in preparing you for your credited courses". That 47.4 percent rated these programs as either "slightly effective" or "in-effective" attests to considerable unmet needs that will not go away or cannot be ignored.

4. Is information about financial assistance programs made available to the Spanish-speaking students?

This question affords the clearest cut answer of all the four policy questions, if you can make a leap of faith that the polled students had the requisite information at hand to fully answer the financial questions we posed.

The information provided to us from the colleges about financial assistance vehicles is so woefully incomplete (see

page 37), we have real questions as to what information and financial assistance services is really being provided to students from low income families (see also page 44).

The second part of this question: Is assistance adequate to make higher education an achievable goal? Without the benefit of determining precisely why Hispanic students have dropped out of college, why other Hispanic high school graduates chose not to continue their education, it is exceeding difficult to come to grips with this question. That it is "achievable" for some, without knowing both the short-range and long-range sacrifices that both the students and their families are making, is not readily apparent. Only a dynamic longitudinal study of various cohorts of students could really begin to answer this very important question.

The fact that in our polled student group there is a significantly lower proportion of Puerto Rican college students coming from families with family income less than $4,000 (20.5%) to the one out of every four (24.1%) Puerto Rican families that reported a comparable command over economic resources in the 1970 Census (see table 28, on page 48) is persuasive evidence that recruitment programs are not reaching far enough but are "creaming".

5) What are the academic, social, family commonalities among currently enrolled Spanish-speaking students?

Our average Puerto Rican college student (see chapter five) is a highly motivated single female, 20 years old, who lives with

both parents, the combined family income is from $6,000 to $8,000, mean family size is five with at least one older sibling having dropped out of school. She has lived on the mainland for seventeen years, earned at least a B average in high school, was admitted to college via a conditional entrance program and is receiving financial aid. She considers herself an average student and her educational aspirations include a college degree with some general thoughts about graduate studies.

6) Specific recommendations are contained within a separate but accompanying document.